Non-analytic exponential well $V(x) = -g^2 \exp(-|x|)$ and an innovated, analytic shooting method

Miloslav Znojil

Nuclear Physics Institute ASCR, Hlavní 130, 250 68 Řež, Czech Republic
e-mail: znojil@ujf.cas.cz

arXiv:1605.06780v1 [quant-ph] 22 May 2016

Keywords:

.

PACS 03.65.Ge Solutions of wave equations: bound states
PACS 02.30.Gp Special functions

Abstract

For a given (and, say, one-dimensional) phenomenological potential $V(x)$ a fairly reliable upper estimate of its low-lying bound-state energies is often provided by the majorization of $V(x)$ by a suitable harmonic-oscillator well $V^{(+)}_{(a,b)}(x) = a + bx^2$. Alternatively, people often construct, numerically, the two asymptotically correct branches of wave functions and match their logarithmic derivatives near the minimum of $V(x)$. Using a toy model $V(x) = -g^2 \exp(-|x|)$ we discuss the situation in which neither of these approaches gives satisfactory results. An optimal strategy of the determination of the spectra is found provided by the shooting method initiated in the origin.

1 Introduction

In quantum mechanics, traditionally, the status of an exactly solvable bound-state Schrödinger equation

$$-\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}x^2}\psi_n(x) + V(x)\psi_n(x) = E_n\,\psi_n(x)\,, \qquad \psi_n(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \tag{1}$$

with a real and confining $V(x)$ is assigned to the square-well [1] and point-interaction [2] non-analytic models or, alternatively, to the strictly analytic potentials $V(x)$ for which some [3] or all [4] of the bound-state wave functions $\psi_n(x)$ happen to be proportional to polynomials.

In 1998 the consistency of applicability of such a classification (or rather separation) pattern was criticized by Bender with Boettcher [5] and, later, by several other authors [6, 7] who revealed that the polynomial solvability may involve also certain manifestly complex but still confining

analytic potentials $V(x)$. This observation was paralleled by Albeverio, Fei and Kurasov [8] and by several other authors [9] who extended the non-analytic exactly solvable class to cover also complex interactions.

Even after the latter two extensions of the scope of quantum physics to complex-interaction models with real bound-state spectra which proved mathematically well-founded (cf. [10]) as well as phenomenologically appealing (cf., e.g., reviews [11, 12, 13]), the well-visible separation of analytic and non-analytic potentials survived. The main reason may be seen in the clear distinction between the respective construction methods. Indeed, the analysis of non-analytic bound states almost exclusively proceeds via the logarithmic-derivative wave-function matching [1]. In contrast, the analyticity of $V(x)$ is usually connected with some symmetries [14] and, typically, with the reducibility of the ordinary differential Schrödinger Eq. (1) to an equation which proves solvable in terms of known (in fact, most often, hypergeometric [4]) special functions.

In our present paper we are going to discuss the possibility of having "a third" class of exactly solvable models exemplified by the toy-model interaction

$$V(x) = -g^2 \exp(-|x|)\,, \qquad x \in (-\infty, \infty) \tag{2}$$

and tractable by a specific combination of the method of the matching of wave functions (at the point of their non-analyticity, i.e., in the origin) with the constructive use of the availability of the general solutions of Eq. (1) in the form of some well known, "next to elementary" (i.e., in our case, Bessel) special functions.

2 Motivation: Ill-behaved upper estimates of the ground-state energy eigenvalues

As long as our benchmark bound-state problem (1) + (2) does not belong to the traditional exactly solvable models, it does not look suitable, in spite of its extreme formal simplicity, to play the role of an illustrative toy model in introductory textbooks. Moreover, in spite of its interesting short-range nature resembling. e.g., the popular Yukawa (i.e., a "short-range Coulomb") interaction $V^{(Yukawa)}(x) \sim e^{-x}/x$, we never found the model used in any phenomenologically oriented approximative considerations.

On this background we felt tempted to test some elementary variational approaches to the upper-bound estimate of ground-state energy $E_0 = -k^2$. We choose the one based on the most elementary majorization by harmonic oscillator

$$V_+^{(HO)}(x) = \omega^2 x^2 - M\,. \tag{3}$$

The results are sampled in Fig. 1. Initially, the inspection of the picture made an impression that the harmonic-oscillator-based upper estimate of the exact ground state energy E_0 cannot be too



Figure 1: Sample of majorization of potential (2) with $g = \sqrt{2}$ (thick line) by harmonic oscillator (3) using $\omega = 1$ with maximal shift $M = M(\omega) = 1.455938091$ yielding the upper estimate of the ground-state energy $E_0 < E_+^{(HO)} = -0.455938091$.

bad. Unfortunately, in a way explained in Appendix A, such an expectation is not well founded because the precision of the estimate appears unexpectedly strongly sensitive to our choice of the freely variable parameters in Eq. (3). In particular, we found that a routine, brute-force numerical solution of the problem yields $E_0 \approx -0.817$, i.e., the ground-state energy value lies quite far below the upper bound HO estimate obtained at a non-optimal value of ω.

The detailed form of the necessity of the careful optimization of the HO estimates is illustrated in Fig. 2. The picture offers not only a strong warning against a naive use of the harmonic-oscillator majorization but it also illustrates why one should replace the variationally motivated variability of the spring constant ω by the variability of the coordinate x_0 of the osculation of the two curves (more details are given in Appendix A).



Figure 2: Upper-bound $F = E_+^{(HO)}$ of the ground state energy E_0 as function of coupling g and of the osculation-coordinate optional parameter ξ.

3 Analytic version of shooting method

Let us now return to the search for an effective alternative to the above-criticized majorization approximation approach. Let us also recollect that for potentials sampled by Eq. (2) it is really possible to search for the bound-state solutions via a proper matching of the left and right branches of the well known and asymptotically correctly vanishing Bessel-function solutions $\sim K_\nu(y)$ with suitable index $\nu = \nu(E_n)$ and argument $y = y(x)$. Finally, let us remind the readers that the practical implementation and realization of such a form of matching in the origin may encounter numerous, mostly purely numerical obstacles.

One of them is connected with the common strategy of the trial-and-error choice and systematic amendment of the variable candidate-for-the-energy parameter $E = E_{(trial)}$ in Eq. (1). Whenever one knows the general solution of the ordinary differential Schrödinger equation in the form of superposition $\psi(x) = c_1\psi_1(x) + c_2\psi_2(x)$ of the two known components $\psi_{1,2}(x)$, and whenever one has to match them in the origin (which is also one of the promising options for our toy model (2) where the available wave function components are Bessel functions), one usually starts from imposing the correct asymptotic behavior analytically. Then one completes the construction via the "smoothness-in-the-origin" strategy, i.e., via the matching of the logarithmic derivatives of the candidate wave functions at $x = 0$.

In the algorithm, the main theoretical difficulty may be seen in the lack of a friendly representation of the asymptotically correct Bessel wave functions $\sim K_\nu(y)$ at small y and near the origin [15]. Another, more practical difficulty reflects the smallness of changes of the resulting

left and right $x \to 0^{\pm}$ limits of $\psi(x)$ after a small change of the value of $E_{(trial)}$. In this sense, irrespectively of the representation of wave functions, the localization of the correct bound-state energy may prove slow and marred by numerical errors.

This leads us to the present proposal of using an opposite strategy. Starting from a guarantee of the correct behavior of superpositions $\psi(x) = c_1\psi_1(x) + c_2\psi_2(x)$ in the origin, we will be able to take advantage not only of having the general solution represented by Bessel functions $J_{\nu(E)}[y(x)]$ and $Y_{\nu(E)}[y(x)]$ but also of the more easily satisfied duty of the localization of the correct bound-state energy $E_n(g)$ via the localization of the largest zero of $\psi(x)$.

Naturally, due to the left-right symmetry of potential (2) one has to distinguish between the even-parity states (with property $\psi(x) = \psi(-x)$, i.e., $\psi(0) = 1$ and $\psi'(0) = 0$) and the odd-oparity states (with property $\psi(x) = -\psi(-x)$, i.e., $\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi'(0) = 1$).

For the sake of brevity let us consider just the former case involving the ground state with $n = 0$ and all of the excited states with even quantum numbers $n = 2m$. Via an elementary change of variables in Eqs. (1) + (2) we may stay, without loss of generality, on the positive half-axis of $x > 0$.

In this setting our proposed extended definition of the exact solvability of the model in question is equivalent to the existence of all of the general even-parity wave functions in the following, entirely non-numerical, $k-$parametrized form

$$\psi\,(x) = D_1(k,g)\; J_{-2\,k}\left(2\,g\,e^{-1/2\,x}\right) + D_2(k,g)\; Y_{-2\,k}\left(2\,g\,e^{-1/2\,x}\right) \tag{4}$$

where we evaluated, after slightly tedious calculations,

$$D_1(k,g) = -\frac{Y_{-2\,k+1}\,(2\,g\,) + k\; Y_{-2\,k}\,(2\,g)\,/g}{J_{-2\,k+1}\,(2\,g\,)\; Y_{-2\,k}\,(2\,g\,) - \; Y_{-2\,k+1}\,(2\,g\,)\; J_{-2\,k}\,(2\,g)}$$

and

$$D_2(k,g) = \frac{J_{-2\,k+1}\,(2\,g\,) + k\; J_{-2\,k}\,(2\,g)\,/g}{J_{-2\,k+1}\,(2\,g\,)\; Y_{-2\,k}\,(2\,g\,) - \; Y_{-2\,k+1}\,(2\,g\,)\; J_{-2\,k}\,(2\,g)}\,.$$

In the subsequent step we simply choose a tentative value of k, plotted our special function (4) as a function of $x \in (0,\infty)$ and counted the number $\mathcal{Z}$ of its zeros.

In the next step (in which we search for the exact bound-state energy $E_{2m}(g)$ we have the following two possibilities, viz., (a) and (b). In the case (a) with $\mathcal{Z} < m$ we declare the current value of k "too large". Having recalled the standard oscillation theorems [16] we choose a slightly smaller next tentative value of k in order to make our next, amended candidate (4) for wave function "more oscillatory". In the case (b) with $\mathcal{Z} \geq m$ we make an opposite move. On the basis of the same oscillation theorems we choose a slightly larger (but not "too large") next tentative value of k in order to make our amended candidate (4) for wave function "less oscillatory".

In practice, the graphical determination of the actual nodal count $\mathcal{Z}$ is extremely easy because if the maximal (i.e., just one) node disappears in infinity, the asymptotic, exponentially quickly

growing part of our tentative $\psi(x)$ simply changes its sign. This makes the resulting "analytic shooting method" easily implemented (typically, one proceeds by halving the interval of eligible ks) and quickly convergent.

Last but not least, the ultimate advantage of the proposed analytic shooting algorithm is that it generates the sequence of parallel upper and lower bounds. In this manner, the above-mentioned $g = \sqrt{2}$ numerical result becomes replaced by the two-sided estimate $-0.81721 < E_0 < -0.81720$ or, if needed, by an unlimited series of its higher-precision amendments.

Needless to add that the "unlimited precision" characteristic of the similar bound-state-energy results is in one-to-one correspondence with the "unlimited precision" nature of the underlying special, Bessel-function wave-function candidates. In this sense one will still encounter a big difference between the models sampled by Eq. (2) (for which we would endorse the "exact solvability" status) and the more general interaction potentials for which the latter candidates must be generated by approximate numerical methods.

The latter observation can be generalized in the sense that the status of exactly solvable (ES) one-dimensional quantum potentials $V(x)$ might be attributed not only to the conventional ES family (yielding wave functions proportional to classical orthogonal polynomials) and not only to the non-analytic square wells and point interactions (solvable by the matching techniques) but also to some interactions "in between", for which the wave functions remain proportional to special functions which, possibly, have to be matched in the origin. In this context the present toy-model $V(x) = -g^2 \exp(-|x|)$ could be simply perceived as one of the simplest illustrative examples.

Acknowledgements

The work on the project was supported by the Institutional Research Plan RVO61389005 and by GAČR Grant Nr. 16-22945S.

References

[1] F. Constantinescu and E. Magyari, Problems in Quantum Mechanics. Pergamon, Oxford, 1971.

[2] S. Albeverio, F. Gesztesy, R. Hoegh-Krohn and H. Holden, Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics. Springer, New York, 1988.

[3] A. G. Ushveridze, Quasi-Exactly Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics. IOPP, Bristol, 1994.

[4] F. Cooper, A. Khare and U. Sukhatme, Phys Rep 251 (1995) 267.

[5] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 31 (1998) L273.

[6] M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 32 (1999) 4563;

M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 33 (2000) 4203.

[7] F. Cannata, G. Junker and J. Trost, Phys. Lett. A 246 (1998) 219;

M. Znojil, Phys. Lett. A 259 (1999) 220;

M. Znojil, Phys. Lett. A 264 (1999) 108;

B. Bagchi and R. Roychoudhury, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 33 (2000) L1;

M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 33 (2000) L61;

M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 33 (2000) 4561;

G. Levai and M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 33 (2000) 7165.

[8] S. Albeverio, S.-M. Fei and P. Kurasov, Lett. Math. Phys. 59 (2002) 227;

M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 36 (2003) 7639;

M. Znojil and V. Jakubsky, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 38 (2005) 5041.

[9] M. Znojil, Phys. Lett. A 285 (2001) 7;

M. Znojil and G. Lvai, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 16 (2001) 2273;

C. Quesne, B. Bagchi, S. Mallik, H. Bila, V. Jakubsky and M. Znojil, Czech. J. Phys. 55 (2005) 1161;

M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39 (2006) 441.

[10] F. Bagarello, J.-P. Gazeau, F. H. Szafraniec and M. Znojil, editors, "Non-Selfadjoint Operators in Quantum Physics: Mathematical Aspects". John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, 2015.

[11] C. M. Bender, Rep. Prog. Phys. 70 (2007) 947.

[12] A. Mostafazadeh, Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. 7 (2010) 1191.

[13] M. Znojil, in Ref. [10], pp. 7 - 58.

[14] A. V. Turbiner, Comm. Math. Phys. 118 (1988) 467.

[15] F. W. J. Olver and L. C. Maximon, Bessel Functions, chapter 10 in "NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions", freely available via address http://dlmf.nist.gov/10

[16] E. L. Ince: Ordinary Differential Equations. Dover, New York, 1956.

Appendix A: The construction of optimal $V_+^{(HO)}(x)$

The inspection of Fig. 1 indicates that once we select the strength of our one-parametric model [i.e., coupling g in (2)] and once we choose an optimal majorizing harmonic oscillator (i.e., a tentative spring constant ω) we have to determine the maximal, optimal value of shift $M = M(\omega)$ after which the two curves [viz., $V(x)$ of Eq. (2) and $V_+^{(HO)}(x)$ of Eq. (3)] touch at a symmetric pair of coordinates $x = \pm\xi$. This means that we have to satisfy the pair of osculation constraints

$$-g^2 e^{-\xi} = \omega^2\xi^2 - M\,, \qquad g^2 e^{-\xi} = 2\,\omega^2\xi\,. \tag{5}$$

Treating ξ as a new free parameter we have, from the latter relation,

$$\omega = \omega(\xi) = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2\xi e^{\xi}}}\,, \tag{6}$$

i.e., a one-to-one correspondence between small ξ and large ω and *vice versa*. Next, the sum of relations (5) yields the second necessary definition

$$M = M_{(\xi)}(\omega) = \omega^2(\xi)\,\left(\xi^2 + 2\,\xi\right) = g^2\,e^{-\xi}\,(1 + \xi/2) \tag{7}$$

which is a smoothly decreasing function of ξ as well. Thus, there emerges a conflict between the decrease and increase of the respective components of the resulting $\xi-$dependent upper bound

$$E_n^{(HO)} = E_n^{(HO)}(g,\xi) = (2n+1)\,\omega(\xi) - M = \frac{ge^{-\xi/2}}{\sqrt{2\xi}}(2n+1) - g^2\,e^{-\xi}\,(1+\xi/2)\,. \tag{8}$$

At $n = 0$ the shape of this function is sampled in Fig. 2 showing that at every given coupling g there exists a sharp minimum of the bound $E_n^{(HO)}(g,\xi)$ at a unique optimal value of $\xi = \xi_0(g)$.

Formula (8) for function $E_n^{(HO)}(g,\xi)$ of the two variables looks complicated but we may still try to determine the curve $\xi_0(g)$ of the minima at a fixed coupling. The problem looks complicated because the corresponding necessary condition $\partial_\xi E_n^{(HO)}(g,\xi_0) = 0$ leads to a complicated equation for $\xi_0(g)$. Fortunately, a pleasant surprise emerges after one employs a computer-assisted symbolic manipulation solver and obtains the inverse function $g(\xi_0)$ in an unexpectedly elementary form

$$g(\xi_0) = \sqrt{\frac{e^{\xi_0}}{2{\xi_0}^3}}\,. \tag{9}$$

In a graphical representation this is a smooth U-shaped curve with a unique minimum at $\xi_0 = 3$. Its shape is determined by the decrease $\sim \xi_0^{-3/2}$ at small ξ_0 and by the increase $\sim \exp(\xi_0/2)$ at large ξ_0.

We must add that the value of $\xi_{critical} = 3$ separates the "curve of extremes" (9) into its left, $\xi_0 = \xi_0^{(useful)} \in (0,3)$ branch (carrying the minima *alias* the optimal estimate values of $E_n^{(HO)}(g(\xi_0),\xi_0)$) and the spurious branch of the variationally useless (and, moreover, even positive, physically useless) maxima of the HO-based upper bound at $\xi_0 = \xi_0^{(useless)} \in (3,\infty)$.